The anonymous review

This is a fair commentary and it lacks the prejudice of Kurtz's but while all that is says appears to be reasonable, it in fact undescores the basic ~~fet~~, fact, that there are remarkably few people in the country who have taken the time to read all the extensive material necessary to a basic understanding of the realities and can know whether a belief or a conjecture is supported by the official fact. Some of this basic fact is hard for a professional scholar to believe because the real story of the assassination and its investigations is without precedent. For example, neither of these reviewers states or reflects any understanding of the fact that in our society an assassination of any President is a de facto coup d'etat. If the assassination has no such intent it does have that result. That was true when Johnson, who held many beliefs that were not Kennedy's, became President. ~~the~~ Johnson also believed that there had been a conspiracy and this is recorded in the disclosed official fact. But as is little known and not mentioned by either reviewer, he agreed on the night of the second day after the assassination to it being assumed that Oswald was the lone assassin and that without any real investigation having been possible for the government to say that the evidence then it had proved Oswald was the lone assassin when it had no such evidence- not then and not when the Commission issued its Report. In fact, it was never possible to place Oswald at the place from which the shots were alleged to have come at the time when they were fired, and he was not there then. The government never had a case that it could have dared take to court and this is without question, although the proofs are buried in the great mass of official assassination records most of which have nothing at all to do with the crime. I have copies of some of this documentation separated for copying and I would suggest that it be used in facsimile to make that information more readily available. I believe it has never been disclosed in facsimile and has rarely been mentioned in the media.

The reviewer's observation that Wrone did not conduct interviews of Church committee and House assassins committee staffs is correct but the reviewer appears not to have understood that Wrone limited himself to the official record and not the opinions of those who had their own and their committees' pasts to defend. With the Church committee the assassination subcommittee was headed by Senator Schweiker. The other member, Senator Hart, had nothing at all to do with it. Schweiker was dominated by the theories none of which had any validity in the existing, available and official fact and he ignored this existing evidence in pursuit of his fanfasy. And got nowhere with all that silliness.

Finding out the truth is ~~mx~~ more difficult now than the author would have

us believe." Wrone did not undertake to address the whole proof of the assassination. His is a study of the importance of the Zapruder film, of one aspect of the assassination and its investigations, one aspect that has never been addressed as he has, with the inclusiveness and the detail and the documentation of that important assassination evidence. But the fact is that as almost none who have written about the assassination understand, it is not possible for private persons to now investigate the assassination because the crime itself was never officially investigated. There is documentation of this and as suggested above, some of it might well be included, in facsimile.

The reviewer's illustrations of what he terms purple prose that are, on their face, reasonable, reflect the lack of knowledge of the extensive official fact, one of the problems created by massive investigation of the irrelevant that created a mass of irrelevand records and by the mass alone was an effective denial of access.

The first is Wrone's statement that "the Church committee 'permanently dishonored the nation'." This refers to the Schweiker subcommittee and when only its interpretation of its obligations is considered the Wrone comment is not excessive. Schweiker began with impossible but attractive preconceptions and nothing else and went nowhere, going anywhere with those baseless notions being impossible.

The second illustration is of the attribution of shame to the CIA and an argument against believing this is that Wrone "claims that the CIA provided a strong criticism of the Warren Commission Report." That proof was not given to the Commission but was withheld by the CIA until its disclosure was compelled by the Rockefeller commission. That Commission, headed by the former Commission assistant counsel, David Belin, in turn suppressed that proof. I did obtain it and I did publish it in facsimile in the 1976 reprint of Photographis Whitewash on pages 295 following.

This reviewer misunderstood what Wrone was saying in his comment that professors have been unwilling to criticize the government. Wrone did not mean it as a general statement. He meant as criticism related to the assassination and its investigations, and that is a true, an unexaggerated statement.

The reviewer believes that many professors "have failed to resolve the matter not for the lack of trying but because the discovery of convincing evidence has proven virtually impossible." This is a reasonable presumption but very few professors have made the effort and the few who have asked questions of me or have used the archive I make freely available to all did not believe the official "solution" to begin with. However, other than in solving the crime, "the discovery of convincing evidence" that the government did not do

what the country expected it to do and that it did not solve the crime is so readily available that I have printed nine books on that, with hundreds of pages in facsimile, including records that were officially suppressed, like those referred to above and like the death certificate. Imagine that in an investigation of a murder the official certificate of death was not only suppressed from twenty-one large volumes, it was hidden in the files so that researchers could not find it by a diligent search for it!

The reviewer's belief that there should be "added thought to the quick dismissal of a possible Cuban connection" illustrates how little understanding of the basic fact there is even among the better informed. For there to have been a Cuban connection that "connection" had to be able to do much more that shoot the President and much more than get away. That was impossible for Cuba or for most countries. Besides which no country would have even dreamed of using an Oswald as an assassin. He was, despite all the obfuscation, so poor a shot years earlier that, as his friends in the Marines testified, they credited him with hits when he missed in their target shooting. And even then Oswald was only a single point above the minimum required of all in the military. The corps' commandant rated Oswald as a "rather poor shot," as one did report. But even more important is the fact that beginning with the solution to the Cuba missile crisis of October, 1962, not only what there considerable change in the policies of the Kennedy administration, that solution guaranteed Castro and Cuba against any invasion. That was a protection Khruschchev could not provide and his inability to provide that is what led to the introduction of Soviet missiles into Cuba. Castro would have had to be an idiot to kill his only real protection in the entire world! That solution was that the United States would protect Cuba against any invasion.

Senator Russell did believe that there might have been a Communist connection, as what Johnson said can be interpreted as meaning, but they knew only what they were given and aside from any preconceptions they may have had what was given to them led them to those beliefs. Neither was given all that was obtained, not any of the information that established the impossibility of the assassination having been a Cuban job.

On the Russell "terminally ill" comment, Russell had emphysema and there was no known cure for it. But it does not kill instantly. It takes years. And as he told and wrote me, it limited what he could undertake after he knew how the Commission had violated its agreed-to procedures and had eliminated from its records the record of his disagreement he was making for history, for Senator Cooper and for himself. I also have documentation of this from the Russell archive

at the University of Georgia at Athens. It is suitable for facsimile reproduction if the University of Georgia's permission is obtained. It includes an eloquent oral history by Senator Cooper/.

In the recommended use of picture, with which I agree, that use requires copyright permission and with the Zapruder family that means a very high cost, which is what they charge.

An illustration of how little the most intelligent have been able to learn about the actualities of the assassination and its investigation, this reviewer is "inclined to accept the unofficial conclusion of the House Select Committee staff director that Oswald killed JFK under mob direction and with help." The fact is that Robert Blakey began with the presumption the assassination was a Mob job and despite the great effort he made to prove it came up blank, there being, in fact, no reason even to suspect that the mafia had the President keilled. Not in the established official fact. It is illustrative of the realities that are almost entirely unknown that the HSCA did not even get from the FBI, and this means after in FOIA litigation I had forced them into the public doman, anything like the volume of those FBI assassination records I had made public. I do not not have access to the files in which the FBI report on what the HSCA got from it but my recollection is that it got almost as many mafia records as it those said to be on the assassination. And those it got on the assassination were not much more than half of what I had obtained by that litigation.

The grim realities are not what an authentic and informed scholar would expect them to be- should be entitled to expect them to be.

This, for example, the abundant criticism of government by scholars on other subjects is assume to be their criticism on this subject, and that is not what the record shows.

If this book is published Wrone will be only the thord person who published a book about the assassination that is devoid of theorizing and restricts itself entirely or almost entirely to the official fact of the official investigations- and about which officialdom was often not correct in interpretation of it or in the meaning given to it.

While this may be hard to believe, that it is the fact is that all I printed on this in all those volumes is what the official record actually says and despite the uninformed slurs by Kraft, who confuses his likes and dislikes with evidence. With the passing of thirty-five years since the publication of my first book, not one of the Commission or of its staf, or of that House committee or its staff has written or phoned me to complain that I was unfair or inaccurate in what I wrote about him. This, not the Kurtz fabrications, is the fact. It reflects the reality.